

JAN 03 2007

Remarks

The above amendments and these remarks are in response to the Office Action mailed August 8, 2006, the Examiner Interview of October 16, 2006, and the Examiner's Interview Summary mailed October 20, 2006. Applicants acknowledge that the Examiner's Interview Summary is correct and complete as to the substance and outcome of the interview.

Applicants thank Examiner Ries and Examiner Bayshore for their assistance in granting an interview on October 16, 2006, during the course of which interview various features of the claimed embodiments were discussed, the substance of which is included herein.

Claims 1-39 and 41-56 were pending in the Application prior to the outstanding Office Action. The Office Action rejected claims 1-39 and 41-56. The present Reply amends claims 1, 12, 15, 23-27, 29-30, 32-33, 39, 42-43, 51, and 53-55, leaving for the Examiner's present consideration claims 1-39 and 41-56. Reconsideration of the rejections is requested.

I. Claim Rejections Pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

The office action rejected claims 1-9, 11, 14-15, 26, 38-39, 42, 51, and 53 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Reber (U.S. Pat. No. 5,903,729) (hereinafter "Reber").

Claims 10, 16-17, 41, and 52 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Reber and further in view of Wright (U.S. Publication No. 2002/0091679 A1) (hereinafter "Wright").

Claims 18-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Reber in view of Wright and further in view of Carro (U.S. Publication No. 2001/0056439 A1) (hereinafter "Carro").

Claims 22-23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Reber in view of Wright and Carro and further in view of Ingram (U.S. Publication No. 2002/0052890 A1) (hereinafter "Ingram").

Claim 21 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Reber in view of Wright and Carro and further in view of Sundaresan (U.S. Pat. No. 6,651,058 B1) (hereinafter "Sundarasan").

Claims 13, 24, 43, and 54 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Reber and further in view of Carro.

Claim 25 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Reber in view of Carro and further in view of Ingram.

Claims 27, 31-33, 36-37, 45, and 48-50 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Reber and further in view of Ingram.

Claims 28, 44, and 55 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Reber and further in view of Bays (U.S. Publication No. 2003/0018632 A1).

Claims 30, 34-35, 46-57, and 56 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Reber in view of Bays and further in view of Ingram.

II. Response to Rejections

Independent Claims 1, 39, and 51 were amended to better define Applicants' invention.

Claim 1 (as amended) states:

A system for detecting an annotated anchor in a displayed electronic document stored in a processor-readable storage medium, comprising:

 a first code in the processor-readable storage medium for locating an annotation on the displayed electronic document, wherein the annotation can be positioned anywhere on the displayed electronic document by the reader; and,

a second code in the processor-readable storage medium for detecting the closest anchor to the annotation, wherein the processor-readable storage medium communicates the first code and the second code to a processor to detect the annotated anchor on the displayed electronic document and to perform at least one process on the annotated anchor.

Claim 1 defines a system for locating the closest anchor to an annotation in an electronic document and then to perform at least one process on the annotated anchor. An annotation can be positioned anywhere on the electronic document by the reader.

Reber (U.S. Patent No. 5,903,729) describes a network navigation device that has a substrate made of a flat piece of material such as paper, cardboard, or plastic with a specific markable region for a user to indicate a resource. Figure 2 shows a user filling in a circle (the markable region) with a pencil to indicate which resource the user is interested in. A scanner is then used to read the information off the marked region of the substrate.

Reber's indication can only be placed in a specific markable region (the circle of figure 2 or similar markable regions for other embodiments), so it does not qualify as an annotation under Claim 1, which requires that the reader be able to position the annotation anywhere on the electronic document. Furthermore, Reber's substrate is made of paper, cardboard, or plastic so it does not qualify as an electronic document.

For the above reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that the embodiment as defined in Claim 1 is neither anticipated by nor obvious in view of Reber. Applicants respectfully request that the rejection to claim 1 be withdrawn.

Independent claims 39 and 51 are believed to be patentable for reasons similar to those discussed above with claim 1. Dependent claims 2-38, 41-50, and 52-56 are also believed to be patentable for the reasons above. It is also submitted that claims 2-38, 41-50, and 52-56 also add

JAN 03 2007

their own limitations which render them patentable in their own right. Applicants reserve the right to argue these limitations should it become necessary in the future.

III. Conclusion

In light of the above, it is respectfully submitted that all claims should be allowable, and a Notice of Allowance is requested. The examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned if he can assist in any way in expediting issuance of the patent.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any underpayment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 06-1325 for any matter in connection with this response, including any fee for extension of time, which may be required.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: January 3, 2007

By: 

Thomas K. Plunkett
Reg. No. 57,253

FLIESLER MEYER LLP
650 California Street, 14th Floor
San Francisco, California 94108
Telephone: (415) 362-3800
Facsimile: (415) 362-2928
Customer No. 23910